

Review Form 1.6

m

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_81283
Title of the Manuscript:	A study on Moral Education Planning program in Bangladesh: Based on Total Quality Management
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The paper deals with a topic of great importance. The major issue with the paper is that it reads like an opinion piece rather than an academic endeavour. The lack of in-text references gives the reader the impression that it is all the author/s opinion. The arguments that justify the paper are not supported by evidence. The author/s use two incidents to illustrate moral decay but provide no context. Are these random events or are they part of a rising trend of events? The author/s need to establish a solid ground for their argument based on evidence.</p> <p>The literature review is very weak. It provides little support for the premise of the argument. Terms should be defined so that the reader understands the author/s' philosophical approach to the work. It should start wide and narrow down to the Bangladesh context to provide the reader with a greater understanding of the issue and where the research question came from.</p> <p>The methodology is, again, an opinion piece. It provides no information as to why qualitative methods were used. What data collection methods were used. How many participants. How they were recruited. Or how the data was analysed.</p> <p>The rest of the paper follows the same form – opinion rather than academic. The use of references and a stronger connection to those references will strengthen the paper.</p> <p>Please see comments in the paper.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>The premise of the paper is great. However, the mechanics of the paper are poor. It needs to be rewritten for more of an academic focus rather than being more of an opinion piece. I encourage the author/s to undertake revisions of the paper.</p>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	S. Bruce Thomson
Department, University & Country	MacEwan University, Canada